

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 25, 2006, claims 1-4, 8, and 9 were presented for examination. Claims 2-4, 8, and 9 were withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected species. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The following remarks are provided in support of the pending claims and responsive to the Office Action of July 25, 2006 for the pending application.

I. Examiner Interview

On October 16, 2006, Applicant's Attorney and Examiner Hoge discussed the rejection of claim 1 in the outstanding Office Action. More specifically, Examiner Hoge and Applicants' Attorney discussed the clarification of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Subsequent to the interview, Applicants' Attorney presented Examiner Hoge with a draft proposed amendment to claim 1. Examiner Hoge and Applicants' Attorney continued the discussion of the proposed amendment to claim 1 on October 23, 2006. During this discussion, Examiner Hoge indicated his preliminary approval of the amendment. Accordingly, the amendment to claim 1 as presented in this Response has already received preliminary approval from Examiner Hoge.

II. Rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action dated July 25, 2006, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner raised an issue with improper antecedent basis for "said adhesive portion" in line 13 of claim 1. Applicants have amended claim 1 to provide proper antecedent basis for this term. Furthermore, the Examiner raised an issue as to whether "attaching the display to a secondary surface is intended to be positively recited as a method step." Applicants have amended claim 1 to positively recite the method of concealing and revealing the adhesive portion. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

III. Conclusion

Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner indicate allowability of claim 1, and that the application pass to issue. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

For the reasons outlined above, withdrawal of the rejection of record and an allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Rochelle Lieberman/
Rochelle Lieberman
Registration No. 39,276
Attorney for Applicant

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC
802 Still Creek Lane
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone: (301) 948-7775
Fax: (301) 948-7774
Email: rocky@legalplanner.com

Date: October 25, 2006